



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

made after engagement is, with an exception to be hereafter referred to, conclusive on the question of fraud, so far as the right of dower is concerned. It is true that in some of the cases the element of actual fraud was shown to have existed, and some of the rulings are placed upon that ground. *Kelly v. McGrath*, 70 Ala. 75 (45 Am. Rep. 75); *Jones v. Jones*, 64 Wis. 301 (25 N. W. 218); *Brown v. Bronson*, 35 Mich. 415; *Smith v. Smith*, 6 N. J. Eq. 515; *Green v. Green*, 34 Kan. 740 (10 Pac. 156); *Petty v. Petty*, 4 B. Mon. 215 (39 Am. Dec. 501); *Jenny v. Jenny*, 24 Vt. 324. But in the great majority of the cases the broad rule is enunciated that a man owes to the woman to whom he is betrothed the utmost good faith, and that he cannot, consistently with that sacred obligation, secretly devest himself of property in which she would by the marriage secure rights which would thereafter be beyond his control. On the proposition that a secret transfer of his real property is, except under special circumstances, fraudulent, as a matter of law, as to her dower right, we cite the following cases: *Davis v. Davis*, 5 Mo. 183; *Swaine v. Perine*, 5 Johns. Ch. 482 (9 Am. Dec. 318); *Chandler v. Hollingsworth*, 3 Del. Ch. 99; *Youngs v. Carter*, 50 How. Prac. 410, affirmed on appeal in 10 Hun. 194; *Cranson v. Cranson*, 4 Mich. 230 (66 Am. Dec. 534); *Pomeroy v. Pomeroy*, 54 How. Prac. 228. See *Gainor v. Gainor*, 26 Iowa, 337; *Thayer v. Thayer*, 14 Vt. 107 (39 Am. Dec. 211, and note). Many of the cases which make an exception in favor of a reasonable provision for children treat of the transaction as fraudulent in all other cases, without reference to the intention of the party who makes the transfer."

---

**PRESUMPTIONS OF FACT.**—In *Bennett v. State* (Ga.), 29 S. E. 920, on an indictment for fornication, there was no proof whether the accused or his partner in the crime were married or single. The lower court instructed the jury that in order to constitute the crime of fornication both must have been single, but that the single state is the natural condition of man and woman, and in the absence of any proof on the subject the law presumes that the single or unmarried state continues. The first portion of this instruction was held on appeal to be proper, but the appellate court reversed the ruling of the lower court as to the presumption that the unmarried state continues, saying: "There is no presumption of law or of fact that a man or a woman is single, nor any presumption to the contrary. There is no presumption that a man is not a member of the church, or of the Masonic or any other order, simply because he was not a member in early life. Nor can it be inferred that a man is uneducated from the fact that such was his original condition. Yet there is as much reason for a presumption in such cases as there is for presuming that a man is unmarried because that must necessarily have been his first state. It may be that at a fixed age a majority of persons are single, and that at a more advanced age a majority are married, but it would be very uncertain and unreliable to presume that a particular individual of either age was single or that he was married. Moreover, why should a man in a civilized community, who is competent to marry, be presumed not to have entered into a contract of marriage, when no presumption arises that he has not entered into any other kind of contract? As above stated, the indictment in this case alleged that the accused and the other party to the offense were single at the time it was committed, and the burden was upon the State to prove the averment."